

It was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that the statements (carton label) "Ingredients—Plant Insulin substances," and (circular entitled "Glucocinine") "(Vegetable Insulin)" and "(Plant Insulin)," were false and misleading. (2) In that representations in the labeling that it was a "plant insulin" which would be efficacious when administered orally in the treatment of diabetes mellitus, that it was "An answer to the intelligent diabetic's prayer," that it was "positively unsurpassed," and that it would help to stimulate the pancreas gland to produce insulin of its own, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for the purposes recommended. (3) In that its label failed to bear the common or usual name of each of the active ingredients.

On May 13, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to the Food and Drug Administration for technical purposes.

522. Misbranding of Chase Formula. U. S. v. 4 Gross Packages of Chase Formula. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3606. Sample No. 37219-E.)

The label of this product not only contained false and misleading therapeutic claims, but it failed to list the active ingredients in the manner prescribed by law and it failed to bear an accurate statement of the amount of alcohol present.

On January 2, 1941, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida filed a libel against 4 gross packages of Chase Formula at Miami, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Chase Laboratory from Detroit, Mich., on or about October 15, 1940; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination of a sample showed that the article consisted essentially of a fatty oil (approximately 16 percent), oleic acid (approximately 5 percent), mineral oil (approximately 2 percent), alcohol (by volume 17.8 percent), a small proportion of triethanolamine, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling that it was efficacious for the treatment of athlete's foot, impetigo, Florida sores, poison ivy, body lice, many types of eczema and skin afflictions caused by external infection; that it would relieve itching and burning of hives and shingles; that it was efficacious in the treatment of muck itch, mango poisoning, and other skin afflictions including many types of eczema, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further (1) in that the statement in the circular "Chase Formula is greaseless" was false and misleading; (2) in that the list of its active ingredients was not placed prominently on the label with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words and statements in the labeling) as to render it likely to be read by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use; and (3) in that the package failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the preparation since the statement on the carton and jar label. "denatured alcohol (25%)," was incorrect.

On January 27, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

523. Misbranding of Savol and Savol Cream. U. S. v. 39 Packages of Savol and 20 Packages of Savol Cream. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 3648, 3649. Sample Nos. 19670-E, 19671-E.)

The labels of both of these products, in addition to bearing false and misleading therapeutic claims, also failed to bear the required ingredient and quantity of contents statements. Furthermore, the bottles holding the Savol solution were packed in unnecessarily large cartons.

On January 9, 1941, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York filed libels against the above-named products at Buffalo, N. Y., alleging that they had been shipped by the Savol Chemical Co. from Mercer, Pa., on or about September 3 and October 1 and 30, 1940; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analyses of samples showed that Savol consisted essentially of cresols, alkali soaps, a small amount of phenol, and water; and that Savol Cream consisted essentially of zinc oxide, barium sulfate, and petrolatum, together with perfume materials. Bacteriological examination showed that Savol Cream was not anti-septic.